UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,944	11/18/2003	L. Keith Lipman	INWO0053	7265

22862 7590 03/16/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, CAM Y T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2162	

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,944	LIPMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cam Y T. Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I (claims 1-18) in the reply filed on 1/4/2006 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.101 because the language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practice application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101.

As regarding claims 1-15:

Claims 1-15 recite "a matter-centric document management system". However, the claims 1-15 fail to contain a hardware for creating metadata fields. Thus, the bodies of claims are merely abstract idea and are being processed without any links to a practical result in the technology arts.

As regarding to claims 16-18:

Claims 16-18 recite "a method of implementing a matter-centric document management system". However, the claims 16-18 fail to contain a tangible result. Thus,

the bodies of claims are merely abstract idea and is being processed without any links to a practical result in the technology arts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 10, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shutt (US 2003/0217034).

As to claim 1, Shutt teaches the claimed limitations:

"a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type" as (paragraph [0166], lines 1-10);

"an attribute assignment logic to automatically create metadata data fields for a new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type" as (figs. 22-23, paragraph [0084], paragraph [0129-0130]).

As to claim 2, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "an metadata copying logic to automatically fill in the metadata fields which correspond to metadata fields in a parent

folder" as (figs. 14 & 27, paragraph [0136]).

As to claim 3, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a security logic to assign a security level to the document, the security level corresponding to a security level of a parent folder" as (paragraph [0170]).

As to claim 4, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a matter creation logic to create a new matter folder, the matter creation comprising: matter type logic to receive a matter type selection from a user, and to create a plurality of folders within the new matter folder, each folder corresponding to a document type" as (paragraph [0181]).

As to claim 5, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a work list logic to receive a list of users for the new matter folder, and to add the new matter folder to a My Matters folder for the list of users" as (fig. 27).

As to claim 8, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a subscription logic to enable a user to subscribe to a matter file, the subscription putting a copy of a matter file in the user's My Matters list" as (paragraph [0082]).

As to claim 9, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to a matter file at a second level, wherein the subscription includes the matter file and documents and other folders" as (paragraph

[0104]).

As to claim 10, Shutt teaches the claimed limitations "where the subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to another user's subscription list and the user may be granted rights to modify another user's subscription list" as (paragraph [0101]).

As to claim 11, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "an email logic to file emails in an appropriate matter file" as (paragraph [0112]).

As to claim 12, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "the email logic to prompt a user to send a copy of an email to the matter folder" (fig. 17).

As to claim 13, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file" as (fig. 1).

6. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of McCotter et al (or hereinafter "McCotter") (US 6401097) and further in view of Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 6, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an email interface to generate an email address for the matter folder, the email address to receive emails and file them in a correspondence folder in the matter folder".

Robertson teaches creating an email address for a database, the email address to receive emails and file (fig. 10, col. 8, lines 10-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of creating an email address for a database, the email address to receives emails and file to Shutt's system to allow a user to communicate with other by using the email.

As to claim 7, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a display address closely related to a matter folder name; and an actual address corresponding to the display address, the actual address being a unique string".

Robertson teaches displaying an email address as a unique string ((col. 8, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of displaying an email address as a unique string to Shutt's system in order to prevent unauthorized user to access a user's address book without permission.

7. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of McCotter et al (or hereinafter "McCotter") (US 6401097) and further in view of Lakis (US 5864865).

As to claim 14, Shutt and McCotter teaches the claimed limitation subject

matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into an ontology based on attributes of the matter file". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to McCotter's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 15, Shutt and McCotter teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a refiling logic to simplify moving a plurality of objects into a matter folder by propagating the metadata to each of the objects in a hierarchical manner". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4,

lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to McCotter's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 10, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al (or hereinafter "Huang") (US 6571245) in view of McCotter et al (or hereinafter "McCotter") (US 6401097).

As to claim 1, Huang teaches the claimed limitations:

"a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type" as a file Data including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type (col. 14, lines 40-50).

Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an attribute assignment logic to automatically create metadata data fields for a new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type". McCotter teaches metadata fields are typically created to contain a particular type of data (e.g. document type Date, Author, Project ID and Status). Some metadata fields can contain multiple data elements per object. For example, a "CC:" or "Recipient" field could have several different names (col. 3, lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply McCotter's teaching of metadata fields are typically created to contain a particular type of data (e.g. document type Date, Author, Project ID and Status). Some metadata fields can contain multiple data elements per object. For example, a "CC:" or "Recipient" field could have several different names to Terek's system in order to allow users to search documents of all kinds easily and quickly and further to improve searching and managing of different types of document efficiently.

As to claim 2, Huang teaches the claimed limitation "an metadata copying logic to automatically fill in the metadata fields which correspond to metadata fields in a parent folder" as (fig. 14).

As to claim 3, Huang teaches the claimed limitation "a security logic to assign a security level to the document, the security level corresponding to a security level of a

parent folder" as (col. 14, lines 55-65).

As to claim 4, Huang teaches the claimed limitation "a matter creation logic to create a new matter folder, the matter creation comprising: matter type logic to receive a matter type selection from a user, and to create a plurality of folders within the new matter folder, each folder corresponding to a document type" (fig. 6, col. 9, lines 5-15).

As to claim 5, Huang teaches the claimed limitation "a work list logic to receive a list of users for the new matter folder, and to add the new matter folder to a My Matters folder for the list of users" as (col. 8, lines 55-67; col. 9, lines 1-5).

As to claim 8, Huang teaches the claimed limitation "a subscription logic to enable a user to subscribe to a matter file, the subscription putting a copy of a matter file in the user's My Matters list" as (fig. 8).

As to claim 9, Huang teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to a matter file at a second level, wherein the subscription includes the matter file and documents and other folders" as (col. 8, lines 35-55).

As to claim 10, Huang teaches the claimed limitations "where the subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to another user's subscription list and the user may

be granted rights to modify another user's subscription list" as (col. 14, lines 55-65).

As to claim 11, Huang teaches the claimed limitation "an email logic to file emails in an appropriate matter file" as (fig. 14).

As to claim 12, Huang teaches the claimed limitation "the email logic to prompt a user to send a copy of an email to the matter folder" (figs. 9 &14).

As to claim 13, Huang and McCotter teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, McCotter further teaches the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file" as (fig. 3).

10. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al (or hereinafter "Huang") (US 6571245) in view of McCotter et al (or hereinafter "McCotter") (US 6401097).and further in view of Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 6, Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an email interface to generate an email address for the matter folder, the email address to receive emails and file them in a correspondence folder in the matter folder". Robertson teaches creating an email address for a database, the email address to receive emails and file (fig. 10, col. 8, lines 10-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of creating an email address for a database, the email address to receives emails and file to0 Huang's system to allow a user to communicate with other by using the email.

As to claim 7, Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a display address closely related to a matter folder name; and an actual address corresponding to the display address, the actual address being a unique string".

Robertson teaches displaying an email address as a unique string ((col. 8, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of displaying an email address as a unique string to Huang's system in order to prevent unauthorized user to access a user's address book without permission.

11. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al (or hereinafter "Huang") (US 6571245) in view of McCotter et al (or hereinafter "McCotter") (US 6401097) and further in view of Lakis (US 5864865).

As to claim 14, Huang and McCotter teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into an ontology based on attributes of the matter file". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being

either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to McCotter's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 15,Huang and McCotter teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a refiling logic to simplify moving a plurality of objects into a matter folder by propagating the metadata to each of the objects in a hierarchical manner". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to McCotter's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

12. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCotter et al (or hereinafter "McCotter") (US 6401097) in view of Britton (US 6591289).

As to claim 16, McCotter teaches the claimed limitations:

"setting up a matter file in response to a user request, the matter file including the plurality of folders" as (col. 3, lines 10-15).

"automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document filed in one of the plurality of folders in the matter file, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type" as teaches metadata fields are typically created to contain a particular type of data (e.g. document type Date, Author, Project ID and Status). Some metadata fields can contain multiple data elements per object. For example, a "CC:" or "Recipient" field could have several different names (col. 3, lines 10-15).

McCotter does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up a matter file including a plurality of

folders, each folder corresponding to a document type".

Britton teaches report templates are stored on the file server 44 as scripted. asp-formatted files, for example, template file 147 used to generate a "Daily Status" report, and as such, each template file includes an ".asp" filename extension which signals to the file server 42 that the browser 65 is requesting that the web server 42, and more particularly, the script interpreter 48 of the web server 42, process any scripting commands found in the template file 147 before responding to the request (col. 9, lines 45-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Britton's teaching of report templates are stored on the file server 44 as scripted .asp-formatted files, for example, template file 147 used to generate a "Daily Status" report, and as such, each template file includes an ".asp" filename extension which signals to the file server 42 that the browser 65 is requesting that the web server 42, and more particularly, the script interpreter 48 of the web server 42, process any scripting commands found in the template file 147 before responding to the request to McCotter's system in order to provide a method of delivering a formatted document over a communications network based on templates to a user.

13. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCotter et al (or hereinafter "McCotter") (US 6401097) in view of Britton (US 6591289) further in view of Lakis.

As to claim 17, McCotter does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the document inheriting metadata information from the one of the plurality of folders into which the document is filed". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to McCotter's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 18, McCotter does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the inherited metadata is inferred". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent

object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to McCotter's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

14. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Britton (US 6591289) further in view of Lakis.

As to claim 16, Shutt teaches the claimed limitations:

"setting up a matter file in response to a user request, the matter file including the plurality of folders" as (fig. 13, paragraph [0105], lines 1-15);

"automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document filed in one of the plurality of folders in the matter file, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type" as (figs. 22-23, paragraph [0084], paragraph [0129-0130]).

Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type".

Britton teaches report templates are stored on the file server 44 as scripted.

asp-formatted files, for example, template file 147 used to generate a "Daily Status" report, and as such, each template file includes an ".asp" filename extension which signals to the file server 42 that the browser 65 is requesting that the web server 42, and more particularly, the script interpreter 48 of the web server 42, process any scripting commands found in the template file 147 before responding to the request (col. 9, lines 45-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Britton's teaching of report templates are stored on the file server 44 as scripted .asp-formatted files, for example, template file 147 used to generate a "Daily Status" report, and as such, each template file includes an ".asp" filename extension which signals to the file server 42 that the browser 65 is requesting that the web server 42, and more particularly, the script interpreter 48 of the web server 42, process any scripting commands found in the template file 147 before responding to the request to McCotter's system in order to provide a method of delivering a formatted document over a communications network based on templates to a user.

15. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Britton (US 6591289) further in view of Lakis.

As to claim 17, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the document inheriting metadata information from the one of the plurality of folders into which the document is filed". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with

respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to Shutt's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 18, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the inherited metadata is inferred". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a

child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to Shutt's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bassett et al (US 2003/0131023).

Contact Information

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162